



University, 2010 WL 582083, \*2 (M.D. Ala. 2010)(EEOC's motion to quash denied because questions posed by a defendant to clarify factual information contained in the EEOC's investigative file "would not be covered under the deliberative process privilege" and because "[t]he EEOC is free to assert proper privilege objections where appropriate, in the manner contemplated by Fed.R.Civ.P. 30(c)(2) during the deposition."), *citing* Turner v. Kansas City Southern Ry. Co., Inc., 2009 WL 651766, \*1 (E.D. La. Mar. 11, 2009), *quoting* Blanks v. Lockheed Martin Corp., 2006 WL 1892512, \*1 (S.D. Miss. July 10, 2006). *See also* Equal Employment Opportunity Comm'n v. Corrections Corp. of Am., 2007 WL 4403528 at \*1 (D. Colo. Dec. 13, 2007)("Plaintiff EEOC is not exempt from a Rule 30(b)(6) deposition."); Serrano v. Cintas Corp., 2007 WL 2688565, \*2-3 (E.D. Mich. Sept. 10, 2007)(Overruled "EEOC's objections to the Magistrate Judge's order denying EEOC's motion for a protective order ['and granting Defendant leave to take a Rule 30(b)(6) deposition of the EEOC']"); Equal Employment Opportunity Comm'n v. Albertson's, LLC, 2007 WL 1299194, \*2 (D. Colo. May 1, 2007)("The disclosure of this information [who was interviewed and what the deponent did to refresh his recollection of the facts in the case] does not reveal the agency's trial strategy or its analysis of the case.").

**DONE** this 20<sup>th</sup> day of July, 2012.

/s/ Katherine P. Nelson  
**KATHERINE P. NELSON**  
**UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE**